

U.S. Application No. 10/569,151  
Response to Office Action mailed September 6, 2007

-5-

### REMARKS

In the office action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-17 as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,139,644 to Lima ("Lima").

Applicants appreciate the opportunity to interview the Examiner on November 30, 2007 to discuss the amendments and remarks set forth herein along with the Examiner's indication of allowability in light of the amendments and remarks. As discussed further below, the prior art does not teach or suggest the piggable looped flowline of the present invention.

### The Figures

In discussing the present application during the interview, it was noted that FIGs. 1 and 2 are prior art representations. It was also noticed that flow line branch 22 was mislabeled as 23 in FIGs. 3 and 8, that a floating "5B" was removed from FIG. 2, and the production facility 5 was mislabeled as "5C" in FIG. 4 and "5E" in FIG. 5. Amendments to the Figures have been made on the replacement sheets attached hereto. These amendments are merely to correct minor errors in form and do not change the scope or content of the application as filed and are fully supported by the originally filed specification. *See, e.g.* para's [0008], [0009], [0022], and [0032]. These minor amendments are believed to place the figures in condition for allowance.

### Rejection of claims 1-17

Claims 1-17 were rejected as anticipated by Lima. In discussing Lima with the Examiner during the interview, it was agreed that Lima does not disclose a system having all of the limitations of the present invention. Amended claim 1 of the present invention calls for, among other things, "a pig inserted into said riser is transported through said looped flowline and returned into said riser." Lima discloses a system having a line 5 for injecting the pig and a separate line 2 for returning the pig. As such, Lima fails to disclose the system of the present invention as set forth in amended claim 1.

U.S. Application No. 10/569,151  
Response to Office Action mailed September 6, 2007

-6-

Allowance of all of the remaining rejected claims is earnestly solicited based on the amendments and remarks set forth above. Because claims 2-17 all depend from amended claim 1, they are believed to be allowable over the cited prior art. As such, Applicant respectfully requests a notice of allowance of the present application for patent.

U.S. Application No. 10/569,151  
Response to Office Action mailed September 6, 2007

**RECEIVED**  
**CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

**DEC 05 2007**

-7-

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the remarks and amendments set forth above, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the Examiner's rejections and allowance of all pending claims 1-17. It is believed that no additional fees are required, but in the event additional fees are necessary, permission to charge deposit account 05-1328 is granted.

If the Examiner believes that a telephonic interview will help advance the application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

12/5/07  
Date

Adam P. Brown  
Adam P. Brown, Reg. No. 52,657

c/oExxonMobil Upstream Research Company  
P.O. Box 2189  
CORP-URC-SW348  
Houston, Texas 77252-2189

**Certificate of Facsimile Transmission**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to Examiner Beach, United States Patent and Trademark Office at (571) 273-8300 on December 5, 2007.

Tracie Matlock  
Tracie Matlock